



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

rather than from a free-trader like Mr. Wells, for Mr. Bates and Mr. Wells, while agreeing often in their conclusions, start out from different premises, and argument between them would be quite futile. A believer in protection for American industries will meet Mr. Bates on common ground, and he alone, if anyone, can show why that protection, which has been accorded capital employed on the land, should not have been given with equal generosity to capital on the sea.

It is to be regretted that Mr. Bates does not make more prominent the petty and abominable abuses and annoyances for which the blundering Acts of Congress are responsible. For instance, restrictions as to residence are imposed upon a native American who owns a vessel; under some circumstances American ships are subject to tonnage taxes from which foreign vessels are exempt; and if an American vessel once falls into a foreigner's possession, whether by sale or capture in war, it can never again be bought back and fly the American flag. Such burdens upon ship-owning cannot be regarded as minor, and there are enough of them to make the business of foreign commerce most vexatious and usually unprofitable.

In the concluding chapters Mr. Bates discusses the various remedies that have been proposed. He advocates the establishment of a department of commerce at Washington, independent of the treasury department, and defends the defeated bounty or tonnage bill of 1890, as being the best measure now practicable.

JOSEPH FRENCH JOHNSON.

University of Pennsylvania.

The Growth of English Industry and Commerce in Modern Times.

By W. CUNNINGHAM, D. D. Pp. 771. Cambridge: University Press, 1892.

[A sequel to "The Growth of English Industry and Commerce in the Early and Middle Ages," by the same author, 1890.]

There are few men deserving of more honor than he who makes the first practicable road through a new country. It is this task which Professor Cunningham, in the volume under review, has completed for the still only partially explored country of English economic history. Much had been done in the investigation and elucidation of certain periods and certain aspects of that subject by various writers, and Thorold Rogers in his great work had heaped up materials for the study of one of its most important sides during five centuries; but a continuous narrative of the whole course of English economic development from the earliest time to the present has now been given us for the first time. Especially in any field of history is the accomplishment of this particular kind of work of the greatest value for later

students. Until a general survey of the field has been made, all study must be more or less unhistorical. An investigation of the agrarian system of the Anglo-Saxons, or of the English in the fourteenth century, or in the eighteenth, is not history. The origin and growth of industrial and agricultural systems, their decay, with its causes and results, the reaction of economic changes on the broader social development, the march of economic ideas, and their influence, these alone are to be considered as economic history in its highest sense. The parts can then be safely re-examined and restated and still retain their character as history, when once the whole has been completely, even if in some parts inadequately, or mistakenly told. The value of Professor Cunningham's work would therefore have been very great if it had been even of moderate erudition, whereas his learning is broad and deep, and much of this second volume is an absolutely new contribution to our knowledge of the subject. The limitations in carrying out such a large plan in the present state of progress in the subject are of course considerable. Many difficult problems had to be left unsolved, and many obscure places still unexplored. The Saxon period is given less space and attention than one would have expected, the treatment of the gilds is certainly very inadequate, the discussion of the agrarian changes of the Tudor period is even more so. Generally speaking Professor Cunningham's elucidation of commerce and economic doctrine is fuller and stronger than that of manufacturing industry, agriculture and land-holding. The Middle Ages is also better understood, in spite of its lack of material, than many movements in modern times.

Of course many of these fields are confessedly lying still practically unstudied, awaiting the investigation of future students. The knowledge and labor of no one man is able to clear them all up. It is a matter of satisfaction that the continued work of such men as Cunningham, Seeböhm, Maitland, Ashley, Vinogradoff, Gross, Andrews and others, bids fair to do much toward filling in the details of the picture during the same generation as that in which its main outlines were sketched.

Yet our fundamental criticism of Professor Cunningham's work is not on the question of its adequacy, but on that of its method of arrangement. He says, "since the growth of industry and commerce is so directly dependent on the framework of society at any one time, it may be most convenient to take periods which are marked out by political and social, rather than by economic changes." He then proceeds, from the Norman conquest onward, to follow the outline of the salient points of English constitutional development. It seems to us that two serious evils result from this placing of political above

economic influences, first, a frequent confusion of cause and effect, and secondly, a false judgment of the economic importance of certain periods. It is possibly true that the constitutional organs of central government which were brought into force under the first Edward were influential in creating a "national economy," but the general character of the next period, 1377 to 1485, was on the author's own showing the result for the most part of purely economic causes and of their reaction on political conditions. Again, in the Tudor period, which were the controlling forces, the economic or the political? The whole force of the absolute government of Henry VII., Henry VIII., and the Protector was opposed to the enclosures and other changes in land-holding of that time, and yet almost without effect. The changes continued and ran their course. Indeed, it was the growing wealth of England, the rise of the middle class, and the separation of classes which made possible the Tudor despotism, and the new position which England was able to take in European affairs. Moreover, political and economic periods can seldom be made co-terminous without distortion of facts. The beginning of Elizabeth's reign was a distinct crisis in political history, but economically speaking, during the first half of that reign the changes of the preceding century were still proceeding, while its latter part was much more closely connected with the Stuart period that follows.

Again, this classification obscures the fact that some periods are of far greater economic importance than others. The changes of the Middle Ages were slow. With the exception of the turbulent fourteenth century, conditions remained remarkably stationary down to the middle of the fifteenth century. The century or more succeeding was a period of rapid fundamental change, until something like equilibrium was reached. Another long period of comparative stability then extended to the last quarter of the eighteenth century. Yet Professor Cunningham gives less than two hundred pages to the period of rapid economic change from 1397 to 1558, while he gives more than four hundred pages to the comparatively barren century and a half of Elizabeth and the Stuarts. The result is that individual experiments in manufacturing and commerce, local, temporary, and comparatively insignificant movements, in such a period as the latter, are treated as if of the same importance as the enclosures of the fifteenth and the nineteenth century, or the changes in the gilds of the sixteenth.

Economic conditions would seem to have passed through a development of their own, largely independent of, though of course not unconnected, with other national forces. Kept stable by the perpetuity of the manorial organization in the country, and that of the gilds in the towns, we have the strong corporate character of mediæval life.

With the decay of this organization in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, began the rapid growth of individualism, a tendency which was, so to speak, checked half way, and restrained for another century and a half by the strong state policy of Elizabeth and her successors. Then in the latter part of last century, with the introduction of the factory system and other new elements, began a new growth of individualism, reinforced now by the teachings of a powerful economic and political school, a movement which only in recent decades seems to be meeting a distinct reaction. Some such thread as this, to be found in the relation of economic phenomena themselves, will alone prove to be permanently satisfactory in tracing the development of English economic history. But after all, this is only a minor criticism to make of such a work. We do not understand that the author feels that the last word has been spoken on any part of his subject, and the continuity, the learning, the good judgment, and the fair-mindedness of the book will make it more and more necessary to readers and later writers as a basis and a model for their own work.

University of Pennsylvania.

E. P. CHEYNEY.

History of Federal Government in Greece and Italy. By EDWARD A. FREEMAN. Edited by J. B. BURY. Second edition. Pp. xlviii, 692. London: Macmillan & Co., 1893.

The first and only volume of Freeman's "History of Federal Government" has long since established a permanent place for itself, so that an extended review, one commensurate with the priceless value of the work, need not be given to the present reprint, which includes, however, an additional chapter on Federalism in Italy and a fragment on Germany. The editor has made no change in the text, except to correct obvious errors; a revision of the references to authorities and an appendix of twenty pages are his main contributions. This single volume is complete in itself; the first two chapters are a masterful discussion of the general principles of Federalism, while the body of the work will probably always remain the standard history of the Greek confederations; in some matters of detail Freeman's conclusions have already been somewhat modified, and they will doubtless be still further affected in the future; but there is less likelihood that the work as a whole will suffer materially. Like Gibbon's "Roman Empire," Freeman's "Federal Government in Greece" seems assured an exceptionally permanent value. That Freeman was not a political prophet is evident; that he could not, in the preparation of his first two chapters, have had the example of a Federal monarchy, Germany, to add to the completeness of his survey,